

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/732,779	12/09/2003	Matthew Marx	MM-1-gw	6896	
7590 11/13/2006			EXAMINER		
Michael I. Kroll 171 Stillwell Lane			MATHEW, FENN C		
Syosset, NY 11791			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•		•	3764		

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summer		10/732,779	MARX, MATTHEW				
Office Action Summary			Examiner	Art Unit ·			
			Fenn C. Mathew	3764			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication app	ears on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comn of period for reply is specified above, the maximum st re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 nunication. tatutory period w will, by statute,	TE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANDI	ION.  be timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>09 De</i>	cember 2003.				
•	•		action is non-final.	•			
, —							
- ,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	t)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. ☑ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
· · · · ·	Claim(s) are subject to restric	ction and/or	election requirement.				
,	,						
	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by th						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:						
	Applicant may not request that any obje		- · ·				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	-	= : :				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	o by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Of	fice Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).			
	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents	have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority	documents	have been received in Applic	cation No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies		• •				
	application from the Internation	nal Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* S	See the attached detailed Office actio	on for a list o	of the certified copies not rece	eived.			
<u>.</u>		•					
Attachmen	• •						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-948)	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma				
3) 🔀 Inforr	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	. 5 540/	5) Notice of Inform				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/09/03</u> .		6) Other:				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (U.S. 4,598,908) in view of Marsh (U.S. 5,725,460) and LaRossa (U.S. 4,960,277). Morgan discloses a dumbbell workout bench including a first support frame the first frame being substantially horizontal for engaging the ground including first and second elongated parallel spaced apart members having opposing ends and a top and bottom surface, the bottom surface engaging the ground, a first pair of upwardly extending support legs (14) being disposed on the top surface of the second end of the first support frame, wherein one each of the support legs corresponds to one each of the first and second members of the support frame, each of the support legs having first and second opposing ends wherein the second end is an upper end and the first end and is attached to the first support frame, a second support frame hingedly attached to the upper end of the first pair of support legs, and cushions. Note that Morgan further discloses a pair of cushions on the frame. Note in figure 2 that Morgan teaches means for incrementally moving upward and bracing the cushion, and that the means comprises a brace having first and second ends adapted to connect the second support frame to permit the cushion to be moved in increments to form a forty-five degree angle

Art Unit: 3764

to a ninety-degree angle (as best understood). Morgan fails to teach a pair of telescoping vertical stanchions using pins and apertures for height adjustment, including upwardly concave dumbbell receptacles, and a dumbbell receptacle located behind the vertical stanchions. Marsh discloses the desirability of such features citing the ability to vertically adjust based on positioning of the user. In view of the teachings of Marsh, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide Morgan with telescoping vertical stanchions having upwardly concave receptacles at the top of the telescoping portion, and a dumbbell receptacle located behind the vertical stanchions in order to allow a user to adjust the height level based on desired exercise. Morgan further fails to teach foldable support legs as substantially claimed. La Rossa teaches the desirability of providing folding tubular legs in an analogous device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide foldable legs as taught by La Rossa in order to allow for greater portability of the device.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fenn C. Mathew whose telephone number is (571) 272-4978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am - 5:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/732,779

Art Unit: 3764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Page 4

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

F.C. Mathew

November 6, 2006